



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

VOL. 83

JANUARY, 1921

No. 1

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Assist. Editor, GEO. P. MORRIS

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

(1815-1828)

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate Subscription Price, \$1.50 a year. Single copies, twenty cents each.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CAN IT BE "A HAPPY NEW YEAR"?

EIGHTY-SEVEN YEARS! That is the age of the Advocate of Peace. To three generations it has made its appeal for an international peace. It enters now upon a new volume. It wishes its readers a Happy New Year.

Yes, it hears the inquiry, "In the light of the present world situation, can men honestly wish each other a Happy New Year? If they do, can they keep a straight face?" The inquiry runs on, "Is there any intelligence or even sincerity in the much talk of men and the chatter of women about international peace?"

We believe that there is a great unintelligence and even a gross insincerity in much of the "talk" and "chatter." We believe that most of the talk about opposition "to all international warfare"; to all "preparations for war"; to the "whole militaristic system"; to all "military training, conscription, and army and navy programs and nationalist-imperialistic propaganda" is uninformed, if not insincere. When people start out in America to secure "pledges from individuals not to participate in any international war in any way, through combatant or non-combatant service, through voluntary financial support, or through the acceptance of service in any armed forces of the State," they are not pursuing an ideal; they are pursuing an illusion. It is proposed

from one quarter to unite for the promotion of such an illusory purpose the following groups: "American Union Against Militarism, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Woman's Peace Party, World War Objectors, World War Veterans, Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion, Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, International Bible Students' Association, Religious Society of Friends, American Freedom Foundation, Industrial Workers of the World, American Socialist Party, World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, American Peace Society, and a great variety of labor unions." The thought of federating such a group may not be insincere; it is certainly not intelligent. It seems to be founded in the assumption either that the United States is itself not a federation for the promotion of the general welfare; or, if so, that the government itself is an impotent and hopeless means of conserving and promoting the common weal.

And yet the American Peace Society wishes its readers a Happy New Year in sincerity and in truth.

The genuine religious aspirations of men survive. That is a helpful, hopeful thing. The best in that religious aspiration looks upon war as opposed to true religion. Devotees of all the religions, therefore, would unite in the common effort toward a better world order. In the new statement of the Quaker position adopted by the Conference of All Friends, held in London, August last, it is assumed at the outset that "the fundamental ground of our opposition to war is religious and ethical. . . . The only absolute ground for an unalterable and inevitable opposition to war is one which attaches to the inherent nature of right and wrong, one which springs out of the consciousness of obligation to what the enlightened soul knows *ought* to be." The Quakers have not forsaken Erasmus, George Fox, Jonathan Dymond. In their "New Statement" they say: "The Christianity which makes war impossible is a way of life which extirpates or controls the dispositions that lead to war. It eradicates the seeds of war in one's daily life. It translates the beatitudes out of the language of a printed book into the practice and spirit of a living person." Thus they call "for a radical transformation of man, for the creation of a new type of person and for the building of a new social order." Thus they believe it necessary "to have a nucleus of people who practice it here in this very difficult present world, who have faith enough in it to make a venture and experiment of trying it, of living by

it and, if need be, of dying for it." They believe that position to be "backed by the eternal nature of things." Later they say: "We accept this revelation of the character of God because it is the highest thing we know. It satisfies our highest and noblest nature; it speaks to our ideal self and helps form and build it. It raises us beyond impulses that are narrow and anti-social; . . . it *works*." Surely there is great sincerity here, and we believe a great intelligence.

We believe the constructive peace movement of America, lasting now over a century, to have been in the main both sincere and intelligent. Readers of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE know what that movement has been and now is. Through self-imposed laws, mutually adopted until they are changed or supplanted, have given to us all we know of political freedom and progress. Only where justice prevails can peace be reasonably expected. It is true for men; it is true for States. The achievement unto justice is the path of peace, political and economic peace. That men and women are laboring for that kind of peace is significant not only of the intelligence and sincerity at the heart of the race, but also of the hope that beckons men on.

The ADVOCATE OF PEACE wishes its readers a Happy New Year.

WOUNDED IN THE HOUSE OF ITS FRIENDS

"**A**ND ONE shall say unto him, What are these wounds between thine arms? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

The committee of ten jurists, meeting at The Hague in June and July last, at the request of the Council of the League of Nations, agreed upon a project for the establishment of an international court of justice. They submitted their project, together with certain recommendations, to the Council. At its meeting in Brussels the Council made certain modifications in the project. The Council submitted its report, including these amendments, to the Assembly meeting at Geneva. The Assembly submitted the report to its Committee No. 3. Committee No. 3 submitted it to a subcommittee of ten persons, five of whom had been members of the committee of jurists meeting at The Hague.

The first meeting of Committee No. 3 was held November 22. At this meeting the chairman of the committee, M. Léon Bourgeois, an ardent supporter of an international court at The Hague Conference of 1907, drew attention to the supreme importance of such a court and to the imperative duty to create it; but he called attention to the fact that the Council had found

the project submitted by the committee of jurists was not wholly in conformity with the Covenant of the League, and that certain political considerations required that the project be slightly amended. It was at this point that the subcommittee of ten was suggested.

The discussion following the presidential address, as contained in the *Procès Verbaux des Commissions*, make interesting reading. Many of the speakers paid warm tributes to Mr. Elihu Root. The amendments proposed by the Council relating to the salaries of the judges, and the like, received no opposition; but there was one important amendment submitted by the Council which provoked no little amount of heated discussion. This amendment was the amendment proposing to take from the court its compulsory jurisdiction.

A careful reading of the addresses reveals the fact that the larger States are unwilling to obligate themselves by agreement to submit justiciable questions relating to the interpretation of treaties and questions of international law, or to the existence of facts constituting a breach of international obligation, or to reparation for the breach of an international obligation, or to the interpretation of the sentences passed by the court, to a court of justice for a final decision. Thus we are confronted with the anomalous situation of M. Léon Bourgeois, whose life interests may be said to have been centered primarily upon such a court; M. Adatci, of Japan, who had been a member of the committee of jurists at The Hague; Lord Robert Cecil, of Great Britain, arch-idealistic and friend of international peace, opposing the plan the world had thought them to favor.

We do not know what sinister influences were brought to bear upon these men, but from the records it is clear that because of them the High Court of Justice was wounded in the house of its friends. From these records it would appear that the particular "friend" who all but killed the project was Lord Robert Cecil. In his speech before the second meeting of the committee, November 24, we find him jealously concerned for fear that the court might supplant the prerogatives of the Council.

Furthermore, he was concerned for the "vital interests" of certain nations, quite as were the men of 1899 and 1907 at The Hague. He piously expressed the hope that the time was coming when nations should be prepared to submit any question to the decision of a purely legal tribunal, "but this ideal stage has not yet been reached." His rapier thrust into the very vitals of the project, however, consisted of his confession that if two parties were not agreed to submit their case to the court, the judgment would not be enforced, especially if it concerned vital interests. "The Council should deal with questions concerning such interests, and the court should decide only the matters which the parties had agreed to